

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

## Addendum # 1



Department Of Executive Services  
Finance and Business Operations Division  
**Procurement and Contract Services Section**  
206-684-1681 TTY RELAY: 711

**DATE ISSUED: July 1, 2004**

RFP Title: **eCommerce Payment Services**

Requesting Dept./ Div.: **King County Department of Executive Services – Finance Management Division**

RFP Number: **140-04RLD**

Due Date: **July 8, 2004—no later than 2:00 PM**

Buyer: Roy L. Dodman, [roy.dodman@metrokc.gov](mailto:roy.dodman@metrokc.gov), (206) 263-4266

1. The proposal opening date remains the same: Thursday, July 8, 2004, no later than 2:00 p.m. exactly.
2. The sign in sheet from the June 28, 2004 pre-proposal conference is available by contacting Cathy Betts at [cathy.betts@metrokc.gov](mailto:cathy.betts@metrokc.gov) or Roy L. Dodman at [roy.dodman@metrokc.gov](mailto:roy.dodman@metrokc.gov). This document is available as either a fax document or via e-mail. If you wish to have the document faxed to you, please include your fax number in your request.

**The following information is provided in response to questions discussed at the pre-proposal conference and/or received by King County:**

Q1: When the County moves into full production with eCommerce applications, do you have a listing of the types of applications and the corresponding payment ranges for each application?

A1: *The County has prepared an Excel spreadsheet to provide vendors with an overview of applications and payment ranges. This spreadsheet will be included with e-mailed versions of this addendum, and is also available by contacting the buyer. Please keep in mind that this overview reflects a "best guess" at this point in time.*

---

---

**TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR AWARD OF A CONTRACT, THIS ADDEMDUM MUST BE SIGNED AND SUBMITTED TO KING COUNTY**

**Sealed proposals will only be received by:**

**King County Procurement Services Section, Exchange Building, 8<sup>th</sup> floor, 821 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104-1598. Office hours: 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., Monday - Friday**

---

---

Company Name

Address		City / State / Postal Code	
Authorized Representative / Title	Signature	Phone	Fax
Company Contact / Title	Email	Phone	Fax

This Request for Proposal – Addendum will be provided in alternative formats such as Braille, large print, audiocassette or computer disk for individuals with disabilities upon request.

*A1 continued:*

*The applications and estimates are subject to change as user agency needs are more clearly defined and as the county gains experience with online payments.*

Q2: Is the County using a convenience fee model for pilot project payments?

A2: *Yes. Please refer to the Excel spreadsheet for details involving pilot projects.* (If you are accessing this addendum through the King County web site, the Excel spreadsheet has been converted into an Adobe Acrobat file, attached at the end of this document.)

Q3: Is the pilot project for eFiling completed yet?

A3: *No. This pilot application will primarily occur during July and August 2004.*

Q4: For e-check applications, is the County interested in being able to validate bank account numbers and validate whether funds are available in a taxpayer's bank account at the time of payment?

A4: *The County is interested in finding ways to validate funds and bank account numbers for e-checks since this may help prevent issues arising after the fact, i.e., NSF situations. To the extent a vendor has options available for the County's consideration, these options should be presented in the response to the RFP. As discussed at the pre-bid meeting, it was noted that the taxpayer's bank account balance could change as the payment is being processed by the vendor, so there is no absolute guarantee that the funds are available until the payment is actually fulfilled.*

Q5: Is the County seeking consulting services/advice for setting up online payments or is the County more interested in utilizing a vendor's financial services for processing online payments?

A5: *The County has already created a payment engine for its online payment applications. Therefore, the County is seeking a vendor that will provide a financial processing service that links to the County's already established payment engine. The vendor's financial processing service must be able to take a handoff of payment information from the County's payment engine, then traffic the online payment to various financial institutions, and then send information back to the county's payment engine for fulfillment. Please refer to the conceptual diagram on page 7 of the RFP.*

Q6: Can there be multiple transactions in a single payment message? In other words, who determines the size of a particular shopping cart?

A6: *There can be multiple transactions in a single payment message. For the pilot projects, customers were allowed to pay up to five accounts in a single payment. Please note that the five account limitation is subject to change when the County moves into full production. The County will ultimately decide on the size of the shopping cart. Vendors are encouraged to provide their advice or guidelines on any limitations that should be placed on the size of the shopping cart as part of their RFP response.*

Q7: Is it possible to review or see a demonstration of the county's pilot for e-check payments? This would provide helpful background or reference information to vendors.

A7: *Because the pilot project for eTax is completed, it is not possible to see a demonstration of the County's process for e-check payments. However, vendors are encouraged to link to the URL web site for the ePets application at <http://146.129.240.205/PetLicensesOnline/pilot.aspx>. The ePets application should provide the background information requested.*

Q8: Is there a document that shows the results/conclusions of the pilot projects?

*A8: There is not a single document that describes the results/conclusions of the pilot projects. However, user agencies have identified their needs for a production environment based on the pilot project experience. These needs are incorporated into the work plan for the production environment. The needs relevant to this RFP have been incorporated into Section II labeled "Part3- Processing and Reporting Requirements." (see page 7).*

Q9: Based on the eCommerce Management Plan, Cybesource handled the payment processing for the pilot programs. Why not continue to use Cybersource? What, if anything, is Cybersource missing for payment processing?

*A9: The County has previously used two vendors for its pilot projects: Cybersource and Amerinet. The contracts with these two companies were limited to only the pilot projects. As the County moves into a full production environment for eCommerce, a longer-term contract is required and such a Contract must be competitively bid. Consequently, the County is encouraging proposals from all vendors interested in providing the online payment services described in the RFP. The County is seeking the best solution in a full and competitive environment.*

Q10: The RFP states the goal for having the pilot applications transitioned into production by August 2004. What does the term "transitioned" mean? Does the vendor just handle the data gathered by the County's forms so that when the payment button is clicked, this sends the customer to the vendor's server to initiate payment processing?

*A10: Moving to a production environment will require additional equipment and security provisions for the County's payment engine. The term "transition" refers to having the pilot applications running on the new payment engine equipment by August 2004. The selected vendor will take a payment handoff of data from the County's payment engine and use this information to initiate payment processing (see answer to question #5 above).*

Q11: As for technical support, how many users do you expect will need phone or online support over the next three years?

*A11: This is an uncertainty because the County is entering the eCommerce field for the first time. The County's goal is to have a payment system that is highly reliable and requires very little phone or online support once new applications are moved into the production phase.*

Q12: It looks like the State of Washington's DIS system and products (i.e., Shana Corporation's products) were used for the pilot projects. Will the County use the DIS system and products for deployment?

*A12: No. The County considered several options for hosting the payment engine, including the use of the State of Washington's DIS system. The County elected to host its own payment engine (see answer to question #5 above).*

King County eCommerce  
Payment Profile  
(as of 06/30/04)

Business Application	Transaction	Payment Type	Pilot Convenience Fee Model	Est. annual trans count	Range of Payments	Comments/Assumptions
eTax (Pilot)	Real Property tax payments (367,000)	eCheck	Set \$1 fee to cover expenses	1st yr 1,00, 2nd yr 2,000, 3rd yr 3,000	varies widely - \$5 to a \$1 million	Based on the Business Case and Pilot experience
eTax (2005)	Personal Property tax payments(70,000)	eCheck	Set \$1 fee to cover expenses	1st yr 300, 2nd yr 600, 3rd yr 900	varies widely - \$5 to a \$1 million	Based on the Business Case
ePet (Pilot)	Licensing fees	Credit Card	\$.85 flat to cover costs	850 (average growth rate 2%)	\$5 - \$500 [Juvenile \$5, Altered \$20, Unaltered \$60, Senior \$12/\$20, Late Fee \$10, \$20, \$40, Donations \$1 - \$500]	Based on the Business Case and Pilot experience
eFiling (Pilot)	Superior Court document filing fees	Credit Card	flat rate to cover costs		\$5 - \$250	From pilot limited population, to be expanded significantly.
ePermits (Fall 2004)	Building & Land Development Permits	Credit Cards	tbd	1st yr 200, 2nd yr 1000, 3rd yr 2000	up to \$10 million	Currently being defined
eRecords (2005)	Certified copies	tbd	flat rate to cover costs		Varies widely - \$1 to \$500	Currently being defined

King County eCommerce  
Payment Profile  
(as of 06/30/04)

Excise Tax Filing? (TBD)	No information known at this time.						future consideration
Court Fines (TBD)							future consideration
Property Servicecs (TBD)							future consideration
Wastewater capacity charges (TBD)							future consideration
Park reservation fees (TBD)							future consideration
etc...							